



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,747	09/25/2003	Il-Dong Park	P56942	4499

7590 10/11/2006
Robert E. Bushnell
Suite 300
1522 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER

MAI, TRI M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3781

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/669,747

Applicant(s)

PARK ET AL.

Examiner

Tri M. Mai

Art Unit

3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-9 and 22-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-9 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 3727

1. The previous restriction is now vacated.
2. Claims 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kadija et al. (4247345). Kadija teaches first and second portions, thread, and an adhesive join together via the first and second portions to provide a moisture tight seal.
3. Claims 22-24, 26, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walter, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter in view of Blake (44275) or Maeser et al. (2903983), or Dawson, Jr. (5670577). Walter teaches a first portion, a second portion, a thread adapted to join together via stitches. With respect to the wax being adhesive, it is submitted that the wax in Walter having the adhesive properties as claimed, i.e., to seal the perforations. To the degree it is argued that the wax is not adhesive as claimed, Blake teaches that it is known in the art to provide adhesive instead of wax, ("thread suitably prepared with wax or other adhesive" col. 1, ln. 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide adhesive instead of wax to provide an alternative material for sealing the perforation.

Dawson, Jr. teaches that it is known in the art to provide hotmelt adhesive compositions to stitched seams. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art provide adhesive as taught by Dawson, Jr. to provide an alternative material for sealing the perforation

In the alternative, Maeser teaches that it is known in the art to provide adhesive sealing the perforation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the adhesive sealing the perforations as taught by Maeser to provide added security.

Regarding claim 29, the new claim does not impart any structure over the container of Walter, or Walter/Blake, i.e., in the final container there are adhesive in the joint including

Art Unit: 3727

adhesive on the folded strip as claimed, i.e., adhesive will permeate all portions of the flaps including area on the inside surface of the folded over strip.

4. Claims 24, 25, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter in view of Blanke (4981258) or Stollberg et al. (3850362). Either Blanke or Stollberg teaches that it is known in the art to provide reinforced paper, i.e., corrugated paper. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide corrugated paper as taught by Blanke or Stollberg to provide added structural support.

It is noted that the term stacked is just a plurality of layer papers that is what is taught by Blank. In other words, each portion of the corrugated paper has three pieces of stacked papers forming the stacked corrugated paper.

5. Claims 27, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter in view of Bugnone (2933232). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide thread stitching tab ending in a tab as taught by Bugnone to enable one to disassemble the container easily.

6. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter in view of Kadija et al. (4247345). To the degree it is argued that Walter does not teach the adhesive the adhesive to the strip. Kadija teaches that it is known in the art to provide adhesive on the folded flap. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide adhesive on the folded flap as taught by Kadija to provide an alternative means for attaching the flaps with stitches.

7. Claims 7-8, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Walter rejection, as set forth in paragraph 6, and further in view of Blanke (4981258) or

Art Unit: 3727

Stollberg et al. (3850362). Either Blanke or Stollberg teaches that it is known in the art to provide reinforced paper, i.e., corrugated paper. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide corrugated paper as taught by Blanke or Stollberg to provide added structural support.

8. Claims 22-26, and 28-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by McCrery (2388277). McCrery teaches a first portion and second portion and an adhesive 24 adapted to join together first and second portions as claimed. McCrery

Note the adhesive filling the holes (pg. 2, ln. 60).

Regarding claim 28 note the various folded over portion as shown in Fig. 3. The recitation can be interpreted as overlapping as shown in Fig. 3 of McCrery.

With respect to the stack of paper, McCrery teaches a plurality of layers of papers (pg. 1, ln. 31).

9. Claims 22, 23, and 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Bugnone (2933232) in view of Kadija et al. (4247345) or Naylor (1560712). Bugnone teaches a container comprising first and second portion, a thread. Bugnone meets all claimed limitations except for the adhesive between the two portions. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide adhesive between the two portions as taught by either Kadija or Naylor to provide a better seal for the container.

10. Claims 7, 8, 22-26, 28-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blank in view of Kadija. Blank teaches a first portion made from a stack of paper and a second portion made from a second stack of paper. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide adhesive between first and second portions to provide added seal.

Regarding claim 7, note that the sewing is made after the application of the adhesive and before the adhesive fully dries, note abstract.

With respect to the adhesive being synthetic, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use synthetic adhesive to provide the desired adhesive.

11. Claims 9, 27, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blank rejection as set forth in paragraph 10, and further in view of Bugnone. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a tab at the end of the strip to enable one to tear out the container easily.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tri M. Mai whose telephone number is (571)272-4541. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Newhouse can be reached on (571)272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


TRI M. MAI
PRIMARY EXAMINER